SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

| the civil docket sheet. (SEE I  | NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVE  | RSE OF THE FORM.)   |                                       |  |   |                         |   |   |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|---|---|
| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS   |  |   |                                       | DEFENDANTS   |   |                         |   |   |
| BRYANT SAMUEL and ANNETTE SAMUEL  |  |   |                                       | NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.  |   |                         |   |   |
| (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff   |  |   |                                       | County of Residence of First Listed Defendant  |   |                         |   |   |
| (c) Attorney's (Firm Na   | ame, Address, Telephone Nu   | mber and Email Addr   | ess)                                  | NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE  |   |                         |   |   |
| Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire<br>Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.<br>30 E. Butler Pike<br>Ambler, PA 19002<br>(215) 540-8888   |  |   |                                       |  | INVOLVED.   |                         |   |   |
| II. BASIS OF JURISI   | <b>DICTION</b> (Place an "X" in  | One Box Only)   |                                       | TIZENSHIP OF P   | RINCIPAL PAR  |                         |   |   |
| ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)  |  | (For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF DEF  Citizen of This State  1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place  of Business In This State  |                                       |  |   |                         |   |   |
| ☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Defendant ☐ Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)  |  | Citizen of Another State  |                                       |  |   |                         |   |   |
|   |  |   |                                       | en or Subject of a reign Country   | 3 🗖 3 Foreign 1   | Nation                  |   | □ 6 □ 6   |
| IV. NATURE OF SUI   | T (Place an "X" in One Box On  |   | 1                                     |  |   |                         |   |   |
| □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property | PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 555 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS  441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment | PERSONAL INJURY  362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage  Property Damage  385 Property Damage  Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  Habeas Corpus:  530 General  535 Death Penalty  540 Mandamus & Othe  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition | G   G   G   G   G   G   G   G   G   G | ORFEITURE/PENALTY  O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug S Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 O Liquor Laws O R.R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational Safety/Health O Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Cher Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act  IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions | BANKRUPTC  □ 422 Appeal 28 USC  □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGH □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURIT □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (92: □ 863 DIWC/DIWW ( □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX S □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaior Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Par 26 USC 7609 | 158                     | 400 State Rea<br>410 Antitrust<br>430 Banks an<br>450 Commerc<br>460 Deportati<br>470 Racketee<br>Corrupt C<br>480 Consume<br>490 Cable/Sai<br>810 Selective<br>850 Securities<br>Exchange<br>875 Customen<br>2 USC 3<br>890 Other Sta<br>891 A gricultu<br>892 Economie<br>893 Environ<br>894 Energy A<br>895 Freedom<br>Act | nd Banking ce ion er Influenced and Organizations er Credit tt TV e Service ss/Commodities/ e r Challenge 3410 atutory Actions ural Acts ic Stabilization Act mental Matters Allocation Act of Information f Fee Determinatior qual Access tionality of |
| <b>又</b> 1 Original □ 2 R   | ate Court A  | Appellate Court   | Reop                                  | pened another (specific  | fy)   | fultidistrict itigation | □ 7 Ju  | ppeal to District<br>adge from<br>lagistrate<br>adgment   |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices Act   |  |   |                                       |  |   |                         |   |   |
| VII. REQUESTED IN   |  |   |                                       | DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  JURY DEMAND:   Yes   No  |   |                         |   |   |
| COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23  VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE   |  |   |                                       | JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No  DOCKET NUMBER   |   |                         |   |   |
| Explanation:  |  |   |                                       |  |   | -                       |   |   |
| DATE  |  | SIGNATURE OF  | ATTOR                                 | RNEY OF RECORD   |   |                         |   |   |

04/30/2013

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

**CIVIL ACTION** 

BRYANT SAMUEL and ANNETTE SAMUEL:

v.

| NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEM  | S, INC. :  | NO.  | :                                    |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| plaintiff shall complete a Ca<br>filing the complaint and serv<br>side of this form.) In the<br>designation, that defendant s                           | nse Management Track De<br>re a copy on all defendants.<br>event that a defendant do<br>hall, with its first appearan<br>a Case Management Track | elay Reduction Plan of this court, counsignation Form in all civil cases at the time (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the result agree with the plaintiff regarding, submit to the clerk of court and serve a Designation Form specifying the track to | ime of<br>everse<br>g said<br>on the |  |  |  |
| SELECT ONE OF THE F   | OLLOWING CASE MA   | NAGEMENT TRACKS:   |                                      |  |  |  |
| (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.  |  |  |                                      |  |  |  |
| (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( |  |  |                                      |  |  |  |
| (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (X   |  |  |                                      |  |  |  |
| (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.   |  |  |                                      |  |  |  |
|   |  | ecial or intense management by   | ( )                                  |  |  |  |
| (f) Standard Management –   | Cases that do not fall into  | any one of the other tracks.   | ( )                                  |  |  |  |
| 04/30/2013<br>Date  | Craig Thor Kimmel<br>Attorney-at-law   | Plaintiffs, Bryant & Annette Samuel Attorney for   |                                      |  |  |  |
| <u>215-540-8888</u><br>Telephone  | 877-788-2864<br>FAX Number   | <u>kimmel@creditlaw.com</u><br>E-Mail Address  |                                      |  |  |  |
| (Civ. 660) 10/02  |  |  |                                      |  |  |  |

## Case 2:13-cv-02375-TR Document 1 Filed 04/30/13 Page 3 of 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

| assignment to appropriate catendar.   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Address of Plaintiff: 163 Waldo Rd., Pasadena, MD 21122   | 2  |  |  |  |
| Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Road, Horsham,   | PA 19044   |  |  |  |
| Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:   |  |  |  |  |
| (Use Reverse Side For   | Additional Space)  |  |  |  |
| Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation  | and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?   |  |  |  |
| (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)  | Yes□ No⊠   |  |  |  |
| Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?  | Yes□ No.   |  |  |  |
| RELATED CASE, IF ANY:   | 105-   |  |  |  |
| Case Number: Judge  | Date Terminated:   |  |  |  |
| Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one y  | ear previously terminated action in this court?  |  |  |  |
|   | Yes□ No⊠   |  |  |  |
| 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior action in this court?                             | suit pending or within one year previously terminated  |  |  |  |
| action in this court:   | Yes□ No⊠   |  |  |  |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier   | The state of the s |  |  |  |
| terminated action in this court?  | Yes□ No⊠   |  |  |  |
| 7 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1   | Clad by the constitution 19  |  |  |  |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Yes□ No 🛱  |  |  |  |
| CIVIL: (Place ✓ in one category only)   |  |  |  |  |
| A. Federal Question Cases:  | B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:   |  |  |  |
| 1.   Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts   | 1.   Insurance Contract and Other Contracts  |  |  |  |
| 2. □ FELA   | 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury  |  |  |  |
| 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury  | 3. □ Assault, Defamation   |  |  |  |
| 4. □ Antitrust  | 4. □ Marine Personal Injury  |  |  |  |
| 5. □ Patent   | 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury   |  |  |  |
| 6. □ Labor-Management Relations   | 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)  |  |  |  |
| 7. □ Civil Rights   | 7. □ Products Liability  |  |  |  |
| 8.   Habeas Corpus  | 8.   Products Liability — Asbestos   |  |  |  |
| 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases  | 9. □ All other Diversity Cases   |  |  |  |
| 10. □ Social Security Review Cases  | (Please specify)   |  |  |  |
| 11. M All other Federal Question Cases  |  |  |  |  |
| (Please specify) 15 U.S.C. § 1692   |  |  |  |  |
| ARBITRATION CERT  | TIFICATION   |  |  |  |
| (Check Appropriate C  | ategory)   |  |  |  |
| I, Craig Thor Kimmel counsel of record do hereby certing Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and |  |  |  |  |
| \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;   | ,  |  |  |  |
| □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.   |  |  |  |  |
| DATE: 04/30/2013  | 57100  |  |  |  |
| Attorney-at-Law   | Attorney I.D.#   |  |  |  |
| NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the   | ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.  |  |  |  |
| I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or  | within one year previously terminated action in this court   |  |  |  |
| except as noted above.  | mann one year proviously communed action in this court   |  |  |  |
| 04/20/2012  | 57100  |  |  |  |
| DATE: 04/30/2013 Attorney-at-Law  | Attorney I.D.#   |  |  |  |
| reconstruction and the second   |  |  |  |  |

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

## 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 BRYANT SAMUEL and 4 ANNETTE SAMUEL, 5 **Plaintiffs** Case No.: 6 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR v. 7 **JURY TRIAL** NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., 8 (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 Defendant 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 BRYANT SAMUEL and ANNETTE SAMUEL ("Plaintiffs"), by and 12 13 through their attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., allege the following 14 against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 15 INTRODUCTION 16 17 1. Plaintiffs' Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices 18 Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seg. ("FDCPA"). 19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 20 Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), 2. 21 22 which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate 23 United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 24 25

U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

- 3. Defendant conducts business and has its principal office located in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

## **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiffs are natural persons residing in Pasadena, Maryland at the time of the alleged harassment.
- 6. Plaintiffs are persons granted a cause of action under the FDCPA.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687

  (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, Pennsylvania 19044.
- 8. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 10. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiffs.
- 11. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 12. Beginning in January 2013 and continuing through April 2013, Defendant repeatedly and continuously contacted Plaintiffs on their home telephone in its attempts to collect a debt.
- 13. Plaintiffs do not owe the debt that Defendant was attempting to collect.
- 14. Instead, the debt Defendant was attempting to collect is owed by their son, who has not lived at their residence since 1999.
- 15. During the relevant period, Defendant called Plaintiffs' home telephone between one (1) and four (4) times per day.
- 16. On multiple occasions, Plaintiffs spoke with several of Defendant's collectors to inform them that the person being called cannot be contacted their number and to stop calling them.
- 17. Defendant failed to investigate the information and/or update its records to avoid the further harassment of Plaintiffs.
  - 18. Moreover, Defendant did not possess any information to contradict

Plaintiffs' statements.

- 19. Nevertheless, Defendant persisted in calling Plaintiffs about a debt of their son.
- 20. Knowing that Plaintiffs did not wish to be called further, the only purpose for disregarding these wishes would be to harass them.
  - 21. Most recently, Defendant called Plaintiffs on April 22, 2013.
- 22. In addition to speaking with Defendant's collectors to try to stop the collection calls, Plaintiffs also followed Defendant's automated prompt system in an attempt to have their phone number removed from Defendant's call list.
- 23. However, once again, Plaintiffs' attempts to stop the collection calls were unsuccessful, as Defendant continued to call Plaintiffs' home on a repetitive and continuous basis.
- 24. Finally, in its attempts to collect the debt, Defendant left numerous messages on Plaintiffs' home answering machine stating that it was a debt collection agency attempting to collect a debt.
- 25. This was extremely embarrassing to Plaintiffs as they do not owe a debt, and on at least one occasion, Plaintiffs' friends overheard the message that Defendant left.
- 26. Defendant called Plaintiffs on a repetitive and continuous basis with the intent of harassing, knowing Plaintiffs were not the correct persons it sought.

- 27. By continuously calling over a debt they did not owe, and failing to update its records to avoid the further harassment of Plaintiffs, Defendant engaged in conduct which as the natural consequences of harassing the recipient.
- 28. Upon information and belief, information was readily available to Defendant, and/or was available in the public domain, that the number it was calling belonged to Plaintiffs and/or was associated with Plaintiffs' home address.
- 29. The repetitive calls to Plaintiffs were harassing, aggravating and highly intrusive.
- 30. Plaintiff has spent time and effort dealing with these calls and trying to stop the collection calls to them for another person.

# DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

#### COUNT I

- 31. Defendant's conduct, detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(3).
  - a. Section 1692b(3) of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from communicating with any person other than a consumer more than once unless requested to do so by such person or unless the debt collector reasonably believes that the earlier response of such person is erroneous or incomplete and that such person now has correct or complete location information.

b. Here, Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiffs more than once about another person's debt, despite having been notified that it was calling the wrong person.

#### **COUNT II**

- 32. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §1692c(a)(1).
  - a. A debt collector violates §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA by communicating with the consumer at any unusual time or place or a time or place known or which should be known to be inconvenient to the consumer, including communication between a debt collector and consumer prior to 8:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m.
  - b. Here, Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA by placing numerous collection calls to Plaintiffs at their home residence about another individual's debt, which was an inconvenient place for Plaintiffs to receive collection calls.

#### **COUNT III**

- 33. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §§1692d and 1692d(5).
  - a. A debt collector violates §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in

conduct of the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt.

- b. A debt collector violates §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring or engaging any person in telephone conversation repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, abuse, or harass any person at the called number.
- c. Here, Defendant violated §§1692d and 1692d(5) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiffs nearly every day, sometimes calling four (4) times a day, about another person's debt with the intent to annoy, abuse, and harass Plaintiffs into paying the debt.

#### **COUNT IV**

- 34. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §1692f.
  - a. A debt collector violates §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.
  - a. Here, Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by failing to update its records to stop the collection calls to Plaintiffs and leaving voicemail messages on Plaintiffs' home answering machine announcing that it was a debt collector and calling to collect a debt, which was overheard by people at their house.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, BRYANT SAMUEL and ANNETTE SAMUEL, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiffs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

## **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs, BRYANT SAMUEL and ANNETTE SAMUEL, demand a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 04 30 13

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig/Thor Kimmel Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888 ext. 116

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com